

LAW OFFICES

NIKOLAI, MERSEREAU & DIETZ, P.A.

THOMAS J. NIKOLAI
JAMES T. NIKOLAI
CHARLES G. MERSEREAU
PAUL T. DIETZ

STEVEN E. KAHM
KIMBERLY S. ZILLIG
KEVIN W. CYR



International Centre
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 820
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3813
Telephone (612) 339-7461
Facsimile (612) 349-6556

PATENTS
TRADE MARKS
COPYRIGHTS
UNFAIR COMPETITION

e-mail: paul@nmd-iplaw.com
direct dial: 612-392-7306

April 28, 2000

#EL643697302US
Our File No. 960565.ORI

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Box AF (Pats)
The Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D. C. 20231

Sir:

Enclosed herewith for filing is the Written Reply Under Rule 37 CFR 1.116 for the patent
"ADAPTER INTEGRATED INTO A LEAD BODY" along with a Certificate of
Mailing.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees or refund any overpayment under 37
CFR 1.17 which may be required by this paper to Deposit Account No. 08-1265.

Yours very truly,

NIKOLAI, MERSEREAU & DIETZ, P.A.

Paul T. Dietz

PTD/tr
Enclosures

RECEIVED
MAY -2 2000
TC 2800 MAIL ROOM



05-01-00

AF/GAU-2833

PATENT APPLICATION

OUR FILE NO. 960565.ORI

*Response
#8
Gnee's
5-30*

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Re App : David M. Flynn et al. : April 28, 2000
S.N. : 09/139,155 / : Exam. Ross Gushi
Filed : August 24, 1998 : Art Unit 2833
For : ADAPTER INTEGRATED INTO A LEAD BODY

REPLY UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.116

Box AF (Pats)
The Commissioner of Patent and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

Dear Sir:

This paper is submitted in response to the official action dated February 28, 2000.

Inasmuch as that Action was made final, this response is submitted for consideration and reply by the Examiner during the third month of the shortened statutory period. For the reasons detailed below, pending claims 1-15 are believed to be in a condition for allowance.

REMARKS

The applicant would like to thank the examiner for the thorough examination of the subject application. The office action maintains the rejection of claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stutz, Jr., ("Stutz") in view of Fain et al. ("Fain"). No new reasons for rejection were given. Applicants respectfully traverses these rejections.

The office action explicitly recognizes that Stutz does not teach an adapting member.

*considered
aff 5/19/00*

RECEIVED
MAY - 2 2000
TC 2800 MAIL ROOM